DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 679 HE 002 282

AUTHOR Haehn, James O.
TITLE Collective Bargaining in Higher Education: An Empirical Analysis in the California State Colleges.
INSTITUTION Chico State Coll., Calif.
PUB DATE 30 Apr 71
NOTE 10p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the California Educational Research Association, San Diego, Cal., April 30, 1971

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Collective Bargaining, *College Faculty, Faculty, Higher Education, *Public School Teachers, *Teacher Characteristics, *Teacher Militancy
IDENTIFIERS *California State College System

ABSTRACT

College faculties have been considerably slower than their public school counterparts in joining in the collective bargaining movement. The first large scale attempt was not made until 1965. The initial campaign to organize faculty in support of collective negotiations was in the California State College system, and the little empirical research that has been done on the subject has focused on the California colleges. This paper discusses and analyzes some of the studies on collective bargaining with those of the college teachers. Although the same variables that are associated with pro bargaining sentiments among public school teachers do not appear while analyzing college teachers, there is a relationship. In both groups the upwardly mobile instructor, with some type of previous exposure to unionism and a politically liberal orientation, is the individual most likely to be among those pressing for the establishment of formal bargaining arrangements. These persons also tend to have a more "professional" commitment within their occupations. In addition, a rise in militant professionalism is apparent among both the public school and college teachers. (AF)

ED052679

Collective Bargaining in Higher Education:

An Empirical Analysis in the California State Colleges

James O. Haehn
Associate Professor of Sociology
Chico State College

HE 002 282

To be presented at the annual meetings of the California Educational Research Association, San Diego, April 30, 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Throughout the United States support for collective bargaining in educational institutions has grown to an extent that is amazing to all who have observed it. This movement has been most prominent in the public schools, especially since 1960 when the United Federation of Teachers won representation rights within the New York City school system. From that time to the present collective bargaining and representation elections have been conducted in school districts across the nation under the sponsorship of the AFT, the NEA, and a variety of independent associations.

College faculty have been considerably slower than their public school counterparts in joining in the collective bargaining movement. This is less true for junior college instructors than for those teaching in four-year institutions, but in neither case has there been a landslide of support for bargaining or unionization. It was not until 1965 that the first large-scale campaign was launched to bring bargaining to the colleges and universities, although there had been scattered attempts to win support for formal negotiation arrangements at certain schools prior to 1965. The 1965 drive did not prove directly successful, but it did lead to similar campaigns some of which have resulted in the establishment of collective bargaining for faculty members. The most notable examples of successful collective bargaining efforts in higher education are: the City University of New York, Central Michigan University, the New Jersey State Colleges, and the State University of New York. In addition, it should be noted that current campaigns are underway to gain bargaining rights for professors in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania.

It is not clear what the immediate outcome of the present collective bargaining efforts will be, since most college teachers have not eagerly rushed to endorse formal negotiations in the past. Still, it is increasingly evident that in the long run a larger and larger number of colleges and universities will be engaged in formal bargaining with their faculties.

Considering the potential significance of the movement toward collective action by faculty within higher education it is surprising that there has been very little research on the subject. In the literature one can find several articles which deal with legal, administrative, and economic facets of the bargaining movement, and a few that are concerned with the polemics of applying the bargaining concept to colleges and universities. Empirical research, however, is very scarce and those few studies that have been done have focused upon the California State Colleges.

The selection of the California State College system as the site of survey research on this question is by itself not surprising. The initial campaign to organize faculty in support of collective negotiations was inthe State Colleges. Thus the professors in the system have experienced the pushes and pulls of the debate over instituting bargaining in the college setting for a longer time than faculty elsewhere.

Research done among public school teachers has frequently dealt with questions of the correlates of support for unionization, bargaining or militancy. Through the identification of these correlates the researchers believe that a better understanding of the movements can be gained and a better groundwork laid for predicting the future of the movements. The studies normally examine variables from the personal backgrounds of the teachers, their orientations on social and political matters, and their perceptions of the educational environments in which they work. The data reported in this paper came from studies of this type with a locus in higher education rather than the public schools.

Table 1 summarizes some of the findings from surveys of public school teachers as these findings are associated with their support for collective bargaining. The results of these studies are not uniform in all respects, but they do provide a basis for the development of some generalizations, which in turn can be tested against the data on professors.

Comparing the six studies of public school teachers provides the basis for drawing a crude composite of the teacher most likely to be among those supporting the establishment of formal collective bargaining in education. This composite individual is most probably a young male, teaching in a junior high school. In educational background he has higher than average formal preparation, and in addition higher than average commitment to the profession of education (although the research implies that this greater commitment is not always present). The pro-bargaining teacher is also a person who has been upwardly mobile into the teaching profession from a working class family, quite likely one in which his father was a union member. With respect to his working environment the pro-bargaining teacher is more dissatisfied than his colleagues, and more prone to endorse the use of militancy in dealing with this dissatisfaction.

Although it does not appear on the table the teacher who supports collective negotiations is much more often than other teachers to be a member of the teachers' union (the AFT). He additionally is more Democratic than Republican in political orientation, more liberal than conservative in social viewpoints, and according to one study he is more likely to be Jewish than Protestant or Catholic.

Interpretations given such a composite lead one to the view that the teacher seeking to win collective bargaining in the schools is a person who has worked hard to move into the professional-white collar world and who has acquired high professional expectations in this process. When the expectations are not fulfilled or appear threatened he turns to the approaches familiar to him from his personal background - namely collective action, often of a militant tone.

An implication of this interpretation is that as the base of recruitment into teaching becomes broader, and as efforts to professionalize mount, one result will be a larger number of people within the occupation who approximate the composite described above.

The second part of Table 1 (columns 7 - 9) report the results of three surveys of faculty members within the California State Colleges. As a rapid glance at the Table reveals the pattern of findings for professors differs in many respects from that found among the public school teachers. Age, for example, seems to be a related factor only to the extent that the older professors are unlikely to support bargaining movements. Sex is also not as clearly related to the endorsement of negotiations among college teachers as it is for the public school instructors. In terms of social background, however, a closer basis for comparison does emerge. The college professor who supports bargaining tends to be a person from upper manual and lower white collar backgrounds and although the base is limited, it does seem that if his father was a trade union member there is a greater likelihood that he will be pro-bargaining. The college teacher who favors bargaining, like his public school counterpart, is also more likely to be a person dissatisfied with his work environment and also willing to endorse militant tactics in attempting to change that environment. He also is more often drawn from the general liberal arts disciplines, especially one of the humanities or social sciences. The strength of this disciplinary relationship, however, has lessened over time, as support for collective action has become more widespread.

There is no evidence that the pro-bargaining professor has any greater educational commitment than those opposed to the movement, although he is more likely to have a higher level of educational preparation. Also, as was true for the public school people the faculty member who supports the establishment of collective bargaining is more likely to be a Democrat in his politics, and to have had prior union experience himself.

Table 2 provides additional information on faculty who support the bargaining concept. The relationship between academic discipline and such support appears more clearly from that table. It should be noted, though that while professors in the humanities and social sciences are most likely to endorse bargaining a much wider range of support appears from the 1970 data - stretching

from the liberal arts fields to all of the other disciplines - except engineering.

The findings of the two surveys dealing with academic rank reflect in part the influence of age (Professors being more likely to be older than Assistant or Associate Professors), but they also suggest two other things. First, the degree of support for formal bargaining has clearly grown at all rank levels over the past two years. Second, the significant break within the academic ranks comes not between the senior and junior faculty, but between the people at the top rank and those at both levels below them.

Faculty endorsing bargaining are not markedly different in their general academic orientations from those who do not support the movement, as the data in the center of Table 2 reveals. The distribution of "educationists" and "disciplinarians" among both of the factions, in 1968 and 1970, is not significantly different. Yet, a pattern does appear in terms of the orientation of the professors to research or teaching. In both surveys a higher percentage of the pro-bargainers indicate a research perspective than is true for the other professors. This greater research interest is probably one of several causes of the dissatisfaction which led the people to turn to bargaining. That is, research support is scarce within the State Colleges, although there are numerous pressures upon faculty to become involved in such projects. Being unable to actively engage in research to the degree they feel they should contributes to the second-class citizenship complex of many State College teachers, and this undoubtably adds to the likelihood of their acceptance of collective action.

The political orientations of faculty are clearly associated with their positions on this bargaining question. The findings of both surveys show that professors who see themselves as liberal or radical are much more prone to also endorse collective action, while those who describe themselves as moderate or conservative are not. The bargaining movement thus is a reflection of ideological differences within the faculties, although the issue has not totally bifurcated the teachers.

This brief presentation and analysis shows that although exactly the same variables that are associated with pro-bargaining sentiments among public school teachers do not appear when analyzing college teachers, there is a relationship. In both groups the upwardly mobile instructor, with some type of previous exposure to unionism, and a politically liberal orientation is the individual most likely to be among those pressing for the establishment of formal bargaining arrangements. The data further suggests that these persons, while not greatly different from their anti-bargaining colleagues, do tend toward a more "professional" commitment within their occupations.

In short, the upsurge of support for collective bargaining is hardly the product of the work of frustrated dissidents who are marginal to their professions. The interpretation of Corwin seems to fit the situation better. That is, what is taking place within public school education and it appears the colleges as well, is a rise in militant professionalism - militancy and pressure for change that is a consequence of educational and occupational concerns, not particular self-oriented special interests. As education continues to become more and more professionalized one can well expect such movements to mount in strength and scope.

Table 1 : A Summary of Research Findings on Teachers Supporting Unionism in Education

	Public School Teachers						State College Professors		
	1 Andreason	2 Cole	3 Corwin	4 Foegen	5 Hellriegel	6 Lowe	7 Lane	8 Haehn	9 Haehn
Age	Older	Younger	Middle Aged	Younger	Younger	----	Younger	Middle Aged	Younger and Middle Aged
Sex	Male	Male	----	No Difference	Male	Male	Female	Male	No Difference
Social Class Background	Manual Occupation	Lower Class	Lower Class	"More Modest"	----	----	----	Skilled Manual and Lower White Collar	Skilled Manual and Lower White Collar
Education	Higher	----	Higher	No Difference	----	Higher	Higher	Higher	No Difference
Professional Commitment	Higher	----	Higher	----	Higher	No Difference	No Difference	No Difference	No Difference
School - Field Concentration	Junior High	Secondary Schools	----	----	Junior High	----	----	Humanities Social Sciences	Liberal Arts
Satisfaction	----	----	----	----	More Dissatisfied	More Dissatisfied	More Dissatisfied	More Dissatisfied	More Dissatisfied
Militancy	----	Militant	Militant	----	----	----	Militant	Militant	Militant
Other	Father a union member	Democrat Father a union member	----	----	----	----	----	Democrat Prior union membership	Democrat

Sources for Table 1

1. Andreasen, Haakon L., "Teacher Unionism: Personal Data Affecting Membership", Phi Delta Kappan, 50, November, 1968, 177
2. Cole, Stephen, "The Unionization of Teachers", Sociology of Education, 41, Winter, 1968, 66-87
3. Corwin, Ronald G., "Militant Professionalism, Initiative, and Compliance in Public Education", Sociology of Education, 38, Summer, 1966, 310-331
4. Foegen, J. H., "Union or Education Association", Changing Education, 2, Fall, 1967, 38-43
5. Hellriegel, Don; French, Wendell; and Peterson, Richard B., "Collective Negotiations and Teachers", Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 22, April, 1970, 380-396
6. Lowe, William T., "Who Joins Which Teachers' Group ?", Teachers College Record, 66, April, 1965, 614-619
7. Lane, Robert E., Faculty Unionism in a California State College, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967
8. Haehn, James O., A Study of Trade Unionism Among State College Professors, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1969
9. Haehn, James O., A Survey of Faculty and Administrator Attitudes on Collective Bargaining, Los Angeles, Academic Senate of the California State Colleges, 1970

Table 2

State College Faculty Supporting Collective Bargaining, by Selected Variables, 1968 and 1970

Percent Supporting Collective Bargaining by:	1968	1970
Academic Rank		
Professor	44%	54%
Associate Professor	57	63
Assistant Professor	59	64
Academic Discipline		
Humanities	58%	72%
Social Sciences	66	69
Natural Sciences	49	57
Business	24	55
Education	42	51
Engineering	33	36
Other Professional	51	56

	Position on Collective Bargaining			
	1968		1970	
	Favor	Oppose	Favor	Oppose
Main Academic Orientation				
To education in general	34%	30%	37%	35%
To college teaching	19	15	17	13
To the State College system	2	5	1	1
To one's present college	0	0	2	1
To the academic department	4	5	4	6
To the academic discipline	41	45	39	44
Total:	100%	100%	100%	100%
To teaching	77%	87%	46%	53%
To research	23	13	54	47
Total:	100%	100%	100%	100%
Political Orientation				
Conservative	3%	10%	4%	20%
Moderate	23	61	30	54
Liberal	63	28	55	25
Radical	11	1	10	1
Total:	100%	100%	100%	100%

Sources: 1968 data: Haehn, James O., A Study of Trade Unionism Among State College Professors, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1969

1970 data: Haehn, James O., A Survey of Faculty and Administrator Attitudes on Collective Bargaining, Los Angeles, Academic Senate of the California State Colleges, 1970